

PATENT
SZS&Z Ref. No.: IO031006PUS / dh
Atty. Dkt. No. INFN/SZ0029

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated August 28, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 28, 2006. Applicant submits this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-42 are pending in the application. Claims 1-40 and 42 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 10 and 29 have been amended. Claim 41 has been canceled. Applicant submits that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 - 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Park* (US Patent Number 6,147,926). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Park* does not disclose "each and every element as set forth in the claim." For example, with respect to claims 1 and 29, *Park* does not disclose "receiving a return signal in the form of the strobe signal transmitted via a second signal path, *the arrival of the return signal indicating an assumed arrival of a strobe signal at the receiving circuit.*" As another example, *Park* does not disclose *providing a return path for a strobe signal and controlling the driving/latching of first and second data in*

PATENT
Szs&Z Ref. No.: IO031006PUS /dh
Atty. Dkt. No. INFN/SZ0029

response to receiving the strobe signal via the return path, as claimed in claims 10, 16, and 18.

As described in the present specification, the return path may be controlled to simulate the actual (forward) path traveled by the strobe signal, thus adjusting for propagation times that vary due to different conditions. Applicant submits that *Park* teaches neither providing a return signal for a strobe signal and certainly does not teach controlling the return path so arrival of the return signal is indicative of arrival of the strobe signal at a receiver circuit, as claimed.

The Examiner argues that *Park* discloses four strobe signals: FRDB strobe, SRDB strobe, first enable, and second enable. (See Office Action: Page: 3, Line: 3; Page: 4, Line: 1; Page: 3, Line: 13; and Page: 3, Line: 15). Applicant submits, however, that none of these signals described in *Park* constitute the claimed signals for which a return path is provided.

As described in the *Park* reference, in response to the FRDB strobe signal generated by the database controlling unit, a first latch provides data to a database controlling unit and to a second latch. (*Park*, Column: 6, Lines: 47-50). Furthermore, a second latch provides data to a third latch in response to the SRDB strobe signal generated by the database controlling unit. (*Park*, Column: 6, Lines: 56-60). As described in the *Park* specification and as illustrated in Figure 2, the FRDB strobe signal and the SRDB strobe signal are sent to an FRDB latch and to a SRDB latch, respectively.

However, *Park* does not teach providing any return path for either the FRDB strobe signal or the SRDB strobe signal to the database controlling unit. Therefore, neither the SRDB nor the FRDB strobe signals constitute "receiving a return signal in the form of the strobe signal transmitted via a second signal path, the arrival of the return signal indicating an assumed arrival of a strobe signal at the receiving circuit", or "issuing a strobe signal via a forward signal path" and "receiving the strobe signal via a return signal path" as recited in claims 1 and 29.

PATENT
Szs&Z Ref. No. : IO031006PUS / dh
Atty. Dkt. No. INFN/SZ0029

The first enable and the second enable signals in *Park* are issued by the latency pipeline controlling unit. (*Park*, Column: 6, Line: 67 – Column: 7, Line:2). As described in the *Park* specification and as illustrated in Figure 2, the first enable signal is sent to an SDO latch and the second enable signal is sent to the database controlling unit. However, *Park* does not teach providing any return path for either the first enable signal or the second enable signal to the latency pipeline controlling unit. Therefore, the description in *Park* of the first enable signal and/or the second enable signal in *Park* does not teach providing a return path for a strobe signal and controlling the driving/latching of first and second data in response to receiving the strobe signal via the return path, as claimed in claims 10, 16, and 18.

Therefore, claims 1, 10, 16, 18, 29 and their dependents are believed to be allowable, and withdrawal of this rejection with respect to these claims is respectfully requested.

Similarly, with respect to claims 27, 32, and 39 *Park* does not disclose "a strobe clock signal line to propagate the strobing clock signal from the controller to the receiver circuit" and "a round trip path comprising a return path for the strobing clock signal back to the controller."

The Examiner argues that a round-trip path is disclosed by *Park*. Specifically, the Examiner states with respect to a round-trip path: "column 6, 42 – 60, the controller round-trip path, along the bidirectional bus between the I/O interface 110 and connecting circuit." (Office Action, Page 3, Lines: 19-20). However, neither column 6, Lines: 42-60 nor the Examiner's reference to the "bidirectional bus between the I/O interface 110 and connecting circuit" teach, describe, or illustrate a round-trip path is provided through which any of strobe signals in *Park* are returned to their originating devices.

Thus, *Park* does not disclose "a round trip path comprising a return path for the strobing clock signal back to the controller." Therefore, Applicant believes claims 27, 32, 39 and their dependents to be allowable, and withdrawal of this rejection with respect to these claims is respectfully requested.

PATENT
Szs&z Ref. No. : IO031006PUS / dh
Atty. Dkt. No. INFN/SZ0029

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/ Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/
Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant